

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 29, 2003 (Paper No. 4). Claims 1 to 12 are pending in this application. Claims 1 to 6 and 9 to 12 have been amended. Claims 1, 5 and 9 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 3 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claims. Applicants have chosen not to rewrite the claims at this time since the base claims for each of Claims 3 and 11 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth below. Consequently, Claims 3 and 11 are seen to be in condition for allowance.

Regarding the Specification, Applicants have amended paragraphs on page 7 of the Specification in accordance with what is shown in Figure 4, as originally filed.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4 to 6, 9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,327,420 (Furukawa); and Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Furukawa.

The present invention is directed to conceptually magnifying, in a display, video browser data, where the data is organized hierarchically in one or more levels. Each of such levels includes multiple frames including a key frame. A parent level is selected, the parent level selection making visible a key frame associated with the parent level. One of a parent-only and a parent-children magnification mode is chosen. If the parent-only mode is chosen, the key frame associated with the parent level and other key frames which are also associated with the parent level are conceptually magnified. If the parent-children

mode is chosen, the key frame associated with the parent level and key frames associated with an associated children level are conceptually magnified.

Independent Claims 1, 5 and 9 as amended respectively define the present invention in terms of a method, an apparatus and a computer program product.

Thus, among its many features, the invention is seen to provide for at least the features of (I) selecting a parent level, the parent level selection making visible a key frame associated with the parent level, (ii) conceptually magnifying, if the parent-only mode is chosen, the key frame associated with the parent level and other key frames which are also associated with the parent level, and (iii) conceptually magnifying, if the parent-children mode is chosen, the key frame associated with the parent level and key frames associated with an associated children level.

By virtue of the feature in which a parent level is selected, making visible a key frame associated with the parent level, video content can be browsed based on frames that are particularly representative of the parent level. By virtue of features (ii) and (iii), in which different key frames are conceptually magnified based on whether a parent-only mode or parent-children mode is chosen, the browsing of video content, even when applied to large amounts of video data, is made more practical and convenient.

The applied reference of Furukawa is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of (I) selecting a parent level, the parent level selection making visible a key frame associated with the parent level, (ii) conceptually magnifying, if the parent-only mode is chosen, the key frame associated with the parent level and other key frames which are also associated with the parent level, and (iii) conceptually magnifying, if the

parent-children mode is chosen, the key frame associated with the parent level and key frames associated with an associated children level.

Regarding the feature of selecting a parent level, Furukawa teaches video editing operations in which the a screen of a display device 19 connected to a computer 19 displays an icon 21 of a video clip (a temporally continuous video material). The video clip icon 21 has at its center 21a a reduced image representing the contents of the video clip, such as a reduced image of the first frame of the video clip in question. See Furukawa, column 3, lines 40 to 46. Furukawa repeatedly makes use of the first frame in this manner as shown, for example in step ST4 of Figure 9.

Although Furukawa describes using a reduced image to represent a video clip such as a first frame, it does not teach the use of a key frame to represent video content, nor does it suggest the attendant benefits that such key frame would provide. As a consequence, Furukawa could not possibly describe selecting a parent level, where the parent level selection makes visible a key frame associated with the parent level.

Regarding features (ii) and (iii), in which different key frames are conceptually magnified based on whether a parent-only mode or parent-children mode is chosen, Furukawa teaches displaying one video clip or a plurality of video clips of temporally continuous material images on a screen. See Furukawa, column 1, lines 44 to 45. Clip icons are created successively on the basis of data received from the disc. The icons thus created are pasted as a first image group in “Clip Bin” window 31. See Furukawa, column 3, lines 58 to 61.

Furukawa discloses the successive creation of clip icons, but does not articulate the manner in which those icons are created, and thus is not seen to teach the use

of key frames. In addition, Furukawa does not distinguish between a parent-only or parent-children mode in its selection of frames. Accordingly, Furukawa could not possibly describe conceptually magnifying, if the parent-only mode is chosen, the key frame associated with the parent level and other key frames which are also associated with the parent level. Furukawa could also not be seen to teach conceptually magnifying, if the parent-children mode is chosen, the key frame associated with the parent level and key frames associated with an associated children level.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing remarks, independent Claims 1, 5 and 9 are believed to be allowable over the applied reference of Furukawa. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) and § 103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,  
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to  
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 78998v1